

Application Number 09/923,176  
Responsive to Final Office Action mailed December 4, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 03 2007

### REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action dated December 4, 2006. Applicant has amended claims 1, 15, 20, 21 and 25. By this amendment, claims 10-14, 19, 20, 34 and 35 are cancelled. Claim 22 was previously cancelled. Claims 1-9, 15, 17, 18, 21 and 23-33 are pending. Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-9, 10-11, 21, 23-28 and 30-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakefield II (US 5,961,561) in view of Barker et al. (US 6,314,422). Claims 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) were rejected as being unpatentable over Doherty et al. (US 6,735,293) in view of Barker et al. (US 6,314,422). Claims 21 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitser et al. (US 5,694,323) in view of Barker et al. (US 6,314,422). Claims 5 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakefield II (US 5,961,561) in view of Barker et al. (US 6,314,422) in view of Doherty et al. (US 6,735,293).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections to the extent such rejections may be considered applicable to the claims as amended. The applied references fail to disclose or suggest the inventions defined by Applicant's claims, and provide no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to arrive at the claimed invention.

### *Independent claims 1 and 25*

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.<sup>1</sup>

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Namely, the references Wakefield II and Barker et al., either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in Applicant's independent claims 1 and 25, as required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Independent claims 1 and 25 have been amended. Namely, claim 1 has been amended to recite a method comprising receiving collected data associated with a customer account and at

---

<sup>1</sup> MPEP 706.02(j).

Application Number 09/923,176  
Responsive to Final Office Action mailed December 4, 2006

least one of a device data type, a census data type and a business data type, generating a data conclusion based on an analysis between the collected data and an advisory rule corresponding to the data type, mapping the data conclusion to advisory information formatted in a plurality of languages, storing the advisory information in a customer account record associated with the customer account, further including dividing the customer account record into a device data type record corresponding to the device data type, a census data type record corresponding to the census data type, and a business data type record corresponding to the business data type, and storing the advisory information in at least one of the device data type record, the census data type record or the business data type record corresponding to the data type associated with the collected data, accessing the customer account record based on a customer account identifier input by a field service provider, accessing the at least one data-type record of the customer record corresponding to the data type associated with the collected data, selecting from the data-type record customized advisory information formatted to a language associated with the field service provider, the language being selected from one of the plurality of languages, and presenting the customized advisory information to the field service provider through a network device. Claim 25 has been amended to recite similar subject matter in computer program product format.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 25 as amended are patentable over the combination of Wakefield II and Barker et al. Specifically, neither Wakefield II nor Barker, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest receiving collected data associated with one of a device data type, a census data type, or a business data type. They also do not teach or suggest generating a data conclusion based on an analysis between the collected data and advisory rule corresponding to the data type. In addition, neither Wakefield II nor Barker et al. teach or suggest dividing the customer account record into a device data type record corresponding to the device data type, a census data type record corresponding to the census data type, and a business data type record corresponding to the business data type. Moreover, neither Wakefield II nor Barker et al. teach or suggest storing the advisory information in at least one of the device data type record, the census data type record or the business data type record corresponding to the data type associated with the collected data.

The Office Action nonetheless implies that Figs. 2-4 of Wakefield II, and more specifically elements 34, 66, 124, 150, 168 and 174 of Fig. 2 teach the storing of advisory

Application Number 09/923,176

Responsive to Final Office Action mailed December 4, 2006

information in a two-tiered customer account record that includes one or more data type records (see the Final Office Action dated December 4, 2006, at page 5, rejection of claims 10 and 11). Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, the referenced portions of Wakefield II do not refer to storage of "advisory information" as recited in claims 1 and 25, wherein the advisory information is mapped from a data conclusion based on an analysis between the collected data and an advisory rule corresponding to the data type. Rather, they merely refer to drive parameter menus each corresponding to a different drive program. These menus allow individual drive parameters for each of four different wheelchair drive programs to be adjusted (see Wakefield II at col. 6, lines 40-43).

In addition, neither Wakefield II nor Barker et al. teach or suggest storing information of any type, much less advisory information in a customer account record, wherein the customer account record is divided into a device data type record corresponding to the device data type, a census data type record corresponding to the census data type, and a business data type record corresponding to the business data type, and storing the advisory information in at least one of the device data type record, the census data type record or the business data type record corresponding to the data type associated with the collected data. Rather, Wakefield II merely stores the data received from a control module associated with a wheelchair, but does not divide the customer account record into a device data type record, a census data type record or a business data type record.

For at least these reasons, the references Wakefield II and Barker et al., either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in Applicant's independent claims 1 and 25, as required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103. The Examiner has thus failed to establish a prima facie case for non-patentability of Applicant's claims 1 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 2-9, 15, 18 and 20 are dependent upon claim 1 and thus include all of the limitations thereof and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 26-33 are dependent upon claim 25 and thus include all of the limitations thereof and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 25. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-9, 15, 18 and 25-33 is therefore respectfully requested.

Application Number 09/923,176  
Responsive to Final Office Action mailed December 4, 2006

***Independent claim 21***

With respect to independent claim 21, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to meet at least the third basic criteria required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Namely, neither the combination of Wakefield II and Barker et al., nor the combination of Koropitzer and Barker et al., teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in Applicant's independent claim 21 as required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Independent claim 21 has been amended to recite a network advisory system comprising a data collector that receives collected data related to a destination facility, the collected data being associated with at least one of a device data type, a census data type or a business data type, an advisory module that receives the collected data from the data collector and generates advisory information based on an analysis between the collected data and an advisory rule corresponding to the data type, a database that stores the generated advisory information in a plurality of language formats in a customer account record divided into a device data type record, a census data type record and a business data type record based on the data type associated with the data collected, a registration/communication module that receives a provider identifier associated with the field service provider; and means for selecting advisory information from the database for presentation to the field service provider, wherein the selecting means selects the advisory information in one of the plurality of language formats based on the provider identifier, and wherein the registration/communication module presents the customized advisory information to the field service provider.

Neither Wakefield II nor Barker et al. teach or suggest that the collected data is associated with at least one of a device data type, a census data type or a business data type. In addition, neither Wakefield II nor Barker et al. teach or suggest an advisory module that receives the collected data from the data collector and generates advisory information based on an analysis between the collected data and an advisory rule corresponding to the data type. Further, neither Wakefield II nor Barker et al. teach or suggest a database that stores the generated advisory information in a plurality of language formats in a customer account record divided into a device data type record, a census data type record and a business data type record based on the data type associated with the data collected.

Application Number 09/923,176  
Responsive to Final Office Action mailed December 4, 2006

The Office Action compares Wakefield II's Figure 1, reference numeral 10 with Applicant's claimed data collector (see the Office Action dated December 4, 2006, page 5, rejection of claim 21). However, reference numeral 10 is merely a wheelchair control module. Nowhere does the Wakefield II disclosure teach or suggest that the collected data is associated with at least one of a device data type, a census data type, or a business data type.

The Office Action further compares Wakefield II's Figure 1, reference numeral 12 with Applicant's claimed advisory module. However, reference numeral 12 of Wakefield II simply refers to a remote computer. Wakefield II merely describes that error codes or diagnostics information may be displayed (see Wakefield II, col. 6, lines 24-34), but does not teach or suggest generation of advisory information based on an analysis between the collected data and an advisory rule corresponding to the data type, as recited in claim 21.

For similar reasons, the combination of Koropitzer and Barker et al. also fails to establish a prima facie case of unpatentability of Applicant's claim 21. Namely, the combination of Koropitzer and Barker et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in Applicant's independent claim 21 as required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Neither Koropitzer nor Barker et al. teach or suggest that the collected data is associated with at least one of a device data type, a census data type or a business data type. In addition, neither Koropitzer nor Barker et al. teach or suggest an advisory module that receives the collected data from the data collector and generates advisory information based on an analysis between the collected data and an advisory rule corresponding to the data type. Further, neither Koropitzer nor Barker et al. teach or suggest a database that stores the generated advisory information in a plurality of language formats in a customer account record divided into a device data type record, a census data type record and a business data type record based on the data type associated with the data collected.

The Office Action nonetheless asserts that Koropitzer discloses a data collector (referring to col. 4, lines 1-30 of Koropitzer) and an advisory module (referring to col. 9, lines 26-64) (see the Office Action mailed December 4, 2006 at page 7). However, col. 4, lines 1-30 of Koropitzer refer only to various status information which may be monitored, and do not teach or suggest collected data being associated with at least one of a device data type, a census data type or a business data type. In addition, col. 9, lines 26-64 of Koropitzer refer again to the various status

Application Number 09/923,176

Responsive to Final Office Action mailed December 4, 2006

information which may be monitored, and do not teach or suggest an advisory module that generates advisory information of any sort, much less an advisory module that generates advisory information based on an analysis between the collected data and an advisory rule corresponding to the data type as recited in claim 21.

For at least these reasons, the references Wakefield II and Barker et al., either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in Applicant's independent claim 21, as required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103. Likewise, the references Koropitzer and Barker et al., either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in Applicant's independent claim 21, as required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103. The Office Action thus fails to establish a prima facie case for non-patentability of Applicant's claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 23 and 24 are dependent upon claim 21 and thus include all of the limitations thereof and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 21. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 21 and 23-24 is therefore respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

May 3, 2007  
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.  
1625 Radio Drive, Suite 300  
Woodbury, Minnesota 55125  
Telephone: 651.735.1100  
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

By:

Kari H. Bartingale  
Name: Kari H. Bartingale  
Reg. No.: 35,183